arXiv:1610.08151v1 [math.PR] 26 Oct 2016

Monotonicity of speed for biased random walk on Galton-Watson tree[1]

Song He, Wang Longmin and Xiang Kainan

School of Mathematical Sciences, LPMC, Nankai University

Tianjin City, 300071, P. R. China

Emails: songhe@mail.nankai.edu.cn (Song)

wanglm@nankai.edu.cn (Wang)

kainanxiang@nankai.edu.cn (Xiang)

Abstract

Ben Arous, Fribergh and Sidoravicius [4] proved that speed of biased random walk RW_λ on a Galton-Watson tree without leaves is strictly decreasing for $\lambda \leq \frac{m_1}{1160}$, where m_1 is minimal degree of the Galton-Watson tree. And Aïdékon [1] improved this result to $\lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}$. In this paper, we prove that for the RW_λ on a Galton-Watson tree without leaves, its speed is strictly decreasing for $\lambda \in \left[0, \frac{m_1}{1+\sqrt{1-\frac{1}{m_1}}}\right]$ when $m_1 \geq 2$; and we owe the proof to Aïdékon [1].

AMS 2010 subject classifications. 60J15, 60J80.

Key words and phrases. Galton-Watson tree, biased random walk, speed, monotonicity.

1 Introduction

In this paper we study biased random walks RW_λ on Galton-Watson trees. And we focus on the the following question: Is speed of RW_λ monotonic nonincreasing as a function of its bias λ when the Galton-Watson tree has no leaves?

Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a Galton-Watson tree with root e, and ν be its offspring distribution random variable with $m = E(\nu) > 1$. Denote by (Ω, P) the associated probability space. Note $\mathbb{T}$ is super-critical and extinction probability $q = P[\mathbb{T} \text{ is finite}] < 1$. Let $\nu(x)$ be the number of children of a vertex $x \in \mathbb{T}$. For any $x \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{e\}$, let x_* be the parent of x, i.e. the neighbor of x lying on geodesic path from x to e. And write $xi, 1 \leq i \leq \nu(x)$ as the children of x.

Given Galton-Watson tree $\mathbb{T}$, for any $\lambda \geq 0$, λ-biased random walk RW_λ, $(X_n)_{n=0}^\infty$, is defined as follows. The transition probability from x to an adjacent vertex y is

$$p(x,y) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\nu(x)} & \text{if } x = e, \\ \frac{\lambda}{\lambda+\nu(x)} & \text{if } y = x_*,\ x \neq e, \\ \frac{1}{\lambda+\nu(x)} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

[1]The project is supported partially by CNNSF (No. 11271204).

Clearly $(X_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a reversible Markov chain for $\lambda > 0$. Let $\mathbf{P}_x$ be the quenched probability of RW_λ starting at x and $\mathbb{P}_x$ the annealed probability obtained by the semi-direct product $\mathbb{P}_x = P \times \mathbf{P}_x$. Denote the respectively associated expectations by $\mathbf{E}_x$ and $\mathbb{E}_x$. A motivation for introducing RW_λ on trees is that this random walk can be used to obtain almost uniform samples from the set of self-avoiding walks of a given length on a lattice ([5]). And for more motivations on biased random walks on graphs, see surveys [12] and [3].

Lyons [8] showed that there is a critical parameter λ_c for RW_λ on a general tree which is just exponential of Hausdorff dimension of the tree boundary, such that RW_λ is transient for $\lambda < \lambda_c$ and recurrent for $\lambda > \lambda_c$. Then in above paper, Lyons proved that for almost every Galton-Watson tree conditioned on non-extinction, RW_λ is transient for $0 \le \lambda < m$. And from Lyons [9], conditionally on non-extinction, RW_m is null recurrent and RW_λ is positive recurrent when $\lambda > m$.

Let $|x|$ be the graph distance between x and e for any vertex $x \in \mathbb{T}$. Note $|x|$ is also the generation of x. *Fix* $X_0 = e$. Speed ℓ_λ of RW_λ is the almost sure limit (if it exists) of $\frac{|X_n|}{n}$ as $n \to \infty$. In this paper, dependence of ℓ_λ with respect to environment will often be omitted.

Transient RW_λ can have zero speed when too much time is spent at leaves. In [11], Lyons, Pemantle and Peres proved that, conditionally on nonextinction, ℓ_λ exists almost surely, and

$$\ell_\lambda \text{ is determinist and positive iff } \lambda \in \left(E\left(\nu q^{\nu-1}\right), m\right).$$

From Lyons, Pemantle and Peres [10], $\ell_1 = E\left(\frac{\nu-1}{\nu+1}\right)$. And in [2], Aïdékon gave an expression of ℓ_λ specified in (2.1) though an artificial parent to e was added therein. For related results, refer to Gantert et al. [7].

Lyons, Pemantle and Peres [11] (see also [12]) raised the following problem, which was called Lyons-Pemantle-Peres monotonicity problem by [4].

Problem 1.1. *Assume $P(\nu = 0) = 0$, namely Galton-Watson tree $\mathbb{T}$ has no leaf. Is the speed ℓ_λ of RW_λ on $\mathbb{T}$ monotonic nonincreasing in $\lambda \in [0, m)$?*

It was conjectured in [11] and [12] that Problem 1.1 should have a positive answer. Obviously, the answer is positive when $P(\nu = k) = 1$ for some k. Whatever, it seems that the speed is nonincreasing for any tree. But this is wrong. For instance, on binary tree with pipes, which is a multi-type Galton-Watson tree, the speed is $\frac{(2-\lambda)(\lambda-1)}{\lambda^2+3\lambda-2}$ for $1 \le \lambda \le 2$. And also for any $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2$, by the repeated filtering method, one can produce a tree such that the speed of RW_{λ_1} is less than that of RW_{λ_2}. Refer to [12] for these facts. Notice the just mentioned examples are not Galton-Watson trees and show the complexity of Problem 1.1. Therefore, if the monotonicity of ℓ_λ holds, then it will be a very fundamental special property of Galton-Watson trees.

For Galton-Watson trees without leaves, the Lyons-Pemantle-Peres monotonicity problem was answered positively for $\lambda \leq \frac{m_1}{1160}$ by Ben Arous, Fribergh and Sidoravicius [4], where

$$m_1 = \min\{k \geq 1 : \ P[\nu = k] > 0\}$$

is minimal degree of the Galton-Watson tree. And Aïdékon [1] improved the just mentioned result to $\lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}$ by a completely different approach. In [6], Ben Arous, Hu, Olla and Zeitouni obtained the Einstein relation for RW_λ on Galton-Watson trees, which implies Problem 1.1 holds in a neighborhood of m. These very slow progresses show Problem 1.1 is rather difficult. For more information on RW_λ on $\mathbb{T}$, see [12] and [3] and references therein. And for monotonicity of speed of biased random walk on groups, see [14].

Now our main result is stated as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *The speed ℓ_λ of RW_λ on Galton-Watson tree $\mathbb{T}$ without leaves is strictly decreasing in $\lambda \in \left[0, \frac{m_1}{1+\sqrt{1-\frac{1}{m_1}}}\right]$ when $m_1 \geq 2$.*

Remark 1.3. *It is interesting to provide a nontrivial example to confirm Problem 1.1. This is an embarrassing problem in a certain sense. The upper bound of λ in Theorem 1.2 is not optimal. And we do not think we can improve it to m_1, not to mention m. To answer Problem 1.1 affirmatively, one potential approach is firstly to improve Lemma 2.3 as follows: almost surely, for some positive random variable $c_{\mathbb{T}_*}$, $\beta_{\mathbb{T}_*}(e, \lambda) \geq c_{\mathbb{T}_*}(m - \lambda)$, $\forall \lambda < m$; and then to refine the method of present paper and [1].*

2 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Inspired by [1], based on some new observations, we prove Theorem 1.2.

Let $\mathbb{T}_*$ be the tree obtained from $\mathbb{T}$ by adding an artificial parent e_* to the root e. For any vertex $x \in \mathbb{T}_*$, let

$$\tau_x = \min\{n \geq 0, X_n = x\},$$

where $\min \emptyset = \infty$, and $(X_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a λ-biased random walk on $\mathbb{T}_*$. And for $x \neq e_*$, let

$$\beta(x) := \beta(x, \lambda) = \mathbf{P}_x(\tau_{x_*} = \infty)$$

be the quenched probability of never reaching the parent x_* of x when starting from x. Since $\mathbb{T}$ has no leaf and $\lambda < m$, we have $\beta(x) > 0$ due to transience. Let $(\beta_i)_{i \geq 0}$ be generic *i.i.d.* random variables distributed under $\mathbb{P}$ as $\beta(e)$, and independent of ν.

In [2], Aïdékon gave the following expression of ℓ_λ :

$$\ell_\lambda = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{(\nu-\lambda)\beta_0}{\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right)/\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{(\nu+\lambda)\beta_0}{\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right),\ \lambda<m. \tag{2.1}$$

Notice (2.1) holds trivially for $\lambda=0$. Here we point out that RW_λ on $\mathbb{T}_*$ and RW_λ on $\mathbb{T}$ has a slight difference, but due to $\lambda<m$ and transience, these two biased random walks have the same speed when starting at e. *Indeed*, we have the following

Lemma 2.1. *For $\lambda<m$, RW_λ on $\mathbb{T}_*$ and RW_λ on $\mathbb{T}$ have the same speed when starting at e.*

Proof. For RW_λ $(X_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ on $\mathbb{T}_*$ with $X_0=e$, define

$$\tau_0=0,\ \sigma_0=\inf\{n\geq\tau_0:\ X_n\notin\{e,e_*\}\};$$
$$\tau_1=\inf\{n\geq\sigma_0:\ X_n=e\},\ \sigma_1=\inf\{n\geq\tau_1:\ X_n\notin\{e,e_*\}\}\text{ when }\tau_1<\infty;$$
$$\text{and for any } i\geq 1,$$
$$\tau_{i+1}=\inf\{n\geq\sigma_i:\ X_n=e\},\ \sigma_{i+1}=\inf\{n\geq\tau_{i+1}:\ X_n\notin\{e,e_*\}\}\text{ when }\tau_{i+1}<\infty.$$

Since RW_λ $(X_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ is transient, there is a unique i_* such that $\tau_{i_*}<\infty$ and $\tau_{i_*+1}=\infty$. Define a random walk $(Y_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ as follows:

$$(Y_n)_{n=0}^\infty=\left(X_{\tau_0},\underbrace{X_{\sigma_0},\cdots,X_{\tau_1}},\underbrace{X_{\sigma_1},\cdots,X_{\tau_2}},\cdots,\underbrace{X_{\sigma_{i_*-1}},\cdots,X_{\tau_{i_*}}},X_{\sigma_{i_*}},X_{\sigma_{i_*}+1},\cdots\right).$$

Then it is easy to see that $(Y_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ is just an RW_λ on $\mathbb{T}$ starting at e. It is known that almost surely, both $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\frac{|Y_n|}{n}$ and $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\frac{|X_n|}{n}$ exist and are deterministic. By our construction, there exists a random function $s(\cdot)$ on nonnegative integers such that almost surely,

$$Y_n=X_{s(n)},\ n\geq 1,\ \text{and}\ \lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{s(k)}{k}=1.$$

Therefore, almost surely,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{|Y_n|}{n}=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{|X_{s(n)}|}{n}=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{|X_{s(n)}|}{s(n)}=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{|X_n|}{n}.$$

This implies the lemma. ∎

For any $n\geq 1$, let $\beta_n(x):=\beta_n(x,\lambda)$ be the probability to hit level n before x_* when $|x|\leq n$. Recall for vertex x, xi is its i-th child and $\nu(x)$ is the number of its children. Then $\beta_n(x)=1$ if $|x|=n$; and for $|x|<n$,

$$\beta_n(x)=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{v(x)}\beta_n(xi)}{\lambda+\sum_{i=1}^{v(x)}\beta_n(xi)}. \tag{2.2}$$

Clearly, $\beta_n(e) \downarrow \beta(e)$ as $n \uparrow \infty,\ a.s.$, and each $\beta_n(x)$ has a continuous derivative in λ when $|x| \le n$. Put

$$A_n(x) = \frac{\lambda}{\left(\lambda + \sum_{i=1}^{v(x)} \beta_n(xi)\right)^2},$$
$$B_n(x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{v(x)} \beta_n(xi)}{\left(\lambda + \sum_{i=1}^{v(x)} \beta_n(xi)\right)^2}.$$

To continue, we need the following Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3. For any natural number d, let $\mathbb{T}_{d+1}$ be the $d+1$-regular tree. Define the following generating function

$$U(x, y|z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}_x\left(\tau_y^+ = n\right) z^n,\ \ x, y \in \mathbb{T}_{d+1},\ -1 \le z \le 1,$$

where τ_y^+ is the first positive time hitting y and $\mathbf{P}_x$ is the law of RW_λ starting at x on $\mathbb{T}_{d+1}$ with a fixed root e. Clearly $\mathbf{P}_x\left(\tau_x^+ = 0\right) = 0$.

Lemma 2.2. *For any $\lambda \ge 0$ and any vertex $x \in \mathbb{T}_{d+1} \setminus \{e\}$ with parent y,*

$$\mathbf{P}_x\left(\tau_y^+ = \infty\right) = 1 - U(x, y|1) = 1 - \frac{\lambda \wedge d}{d}.$$

Proof. Obviously $U(x, y|z)$ is absolutely convergent for $|z| \le 1$. And for $0 \le z \le 1$, we have a probability interpretation: $U(x, y|z)$ is the probability of ever visiting y in the random walk where it dies out at each step with probability $1 - z$.

Consider the λ-biased random walk on $\mathbb{T}_{d+1}$. Since y is the parent of x, by taking one step on $\mathbb{T}_{d+1}$ starting at x, we can see that either with probability $\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+d}$ the random walk hits y, or the random walk moves to the children of x with probability $\frac{d}{\lambda+d}$. Notice that in the second case, in order to return y, the random walk must return firstly to x and then hit y. So by the symmetry of $\mathbb{T}_{d+1}$,

$$U(x, y|z) = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + d} z + \frac{d}{\lambda + d} z U(x_1, x|z) U(x, y|z).$$

Here x_1 is a child of x. Notice that τ_x^+ under $\mathbf{P}_{x_1}$ has the same law as τ_y^+ under $\mathbf{P}_x$. We have that

$$U(x_1, x|z) = U(x, y|z).$$

Therefore,

$$U(x, y|z) = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + d} z + \frac{d}{\lambda + d} z U(x, y|z)^2;$$

which implies that

$$U(x, y|z) = \frac{(\lambda + d) \pm \sqrt{(\lambda + d)^2 - 4d\lambda z^2}}{2dz}.$$

Due to $U(x,y|z)$ is continuous for $|z|<1$, we have

$$U(x,y|z)=\frac{(\lambda+d)-\sqrt{(\lambda+d)^2-4d\lambda z^2}}{2dz}.$$

And further

$$U(x,y|1)=\frac{\lambda+d-|d-\lambda|}{2d}=\frac{\lambda\wedge d}{d}.$$

By the definition of τ_y^+, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}_x\left(\tau_y^+=\infty\right)=1-U(x,y|1)=1-\frac{\lambda\wedge d}{d}.$$

∎

Let us interpret $\beta(e)$ in the framework of electric networks. Given any weighted graph (in another word, electric network) $G=(V(G),E(G))$ with nonnegative edge weight function c. Note weights are called conductances. Suppose $a\in V(G)$ and $Z\subseteq V(G)$. Write

$$\mathbf{P}_a^{G,c}(a\to Z)=\mathbf{P}_a^{G,c}\left(\tau_Z<\tau_a^+\right),$$

where $\tau_Z=\inf\{n\geq 0:\ X_n\in Z\}$, $\tau_a^+=\inf\{n\geq 1:\ X_n=a\}$, $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is the random walk associated with electric network G, and $\mathbf{P}_a^{G,c}$ is the law of $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ starting at a. Let

$$\pi(x)=\sum_{y\in V(G):\ y\sim x}c(\{x,y\}),\ \forall x\in V(G),\ \text{where } y\sim x \text{ means } y \text{ is adjacent to } x.$$

Then $\pi(\cdot)$ is a stationary measure of $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$. Call

$$\mathcal{C}_G(a\leftrightarrow Z):=\mathcal{C}_{G,c}(a\leftrightarrow Z)=\pi(a)\mathbf{P}_a^{G,c}(a\to Z)$$

effective conductance between a and Z. Use $\mathbf{P}_a^{G,c}(a\to\infty)$ to denote the probability of $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ never returning to a when $X_0=a$. Then call

$$\mathcal{C}_G(a\leftrightarrow\infty):=\mathcal{C}_{G,c}(a\leftrightarrow\infty)=\pi(a)\mathbf{P}_a^{G,c}(a\to\infty)$$

effective conductance from a to ∞ in G.

To emphasize on $\mathbb{T}_*$, denote $\beta(e)=\beta(e,\lambda)$ by $\beta_{\mathbb{T}_*}(e,\lambda)$. When $\lambda>0$, on $\mathbb{T}_*$, endow any edge $\{x,y\}$ with $x,y\neq e_*$ with a weight $\lambda^{-|x|\wedge|y|-1}$, and edge $\{e_*,e\}$ with a weight 1; and denote this weight function by c_0. Then for $\lambda>0$, the RW_λ on $\mathbb{T}_*$ is the random walk associated with weighted graph (electric network) $\mathbb{T}_*$; and

$$\beta_{\mathbb{T}_*}(e,\lambda)=\mathbf{P}_{e_*}^{\mathbb{T}_*,c_0}(e_*\to\infty)=\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{T}_*,c_0}(e_*\leftrightarrow\infty).$$

Lemma 2.3. *Assume Galton-Watson tree $\mathbb{T}$ has no leaf. Then almost surely*

$$1-\frac{\lambda\wedge m_1}{m_1}\le\beta_{\mathbb{T}_*}(e,\lambda)\le 1-\frac{\lambda}{m_2},\ \ \lambda\in[0,m),$$

where $m_2=\sup\{k\ge 1:\ P[\nu=k]>0\}$.

Proof. When $m_2=\infty$, $\beta(e)\le 1-\frac{\lambda}{m_2}$ holds trivially. Clearly the lemma is true for $\lambda=0$. So we assume $m_2<\infty$ (namely ν takes finitely many values) and $0<\lambda<m$. Through a natural way, we can embed an m_1-ary tree $\mathbb{H}^1$ into $\mathbb{T}$ and also embed $\mathbb{T}$ into an m_2-ary tree $\mathbb{H}^2$ such that roots of $\mathbb{H}^1$ and $\mathbb{H}^2$ are root e of $\mathbb{T}$. Similarly to $\mathbb{T}_*$, let each $\mathbb{H}^i_*$ be obtained from $\mathbb{H}^i$ by adding the artificial parent e_* of e to $\mathbb{H}^i$.

Like electric network $(\mathbb{T}_*,c_0)$, we endow a weight function c_i to each $\mathbb{H}^i_*$. And view c_0 and c_1 as functions on the set of edges of $\mathbb{H}^2_*$ by letting that

$$c_0(\{x,y\})=0\ (\text{resp. } c_1(\{x,y\})=0)$$

when $\{x,y\}$ is not an edge of $\mathbb{T}_*$ (resp. $\mathbb{H}^1_*$). Then $c_1(\{x,y\})\le c_0(\{x,y\})\le c_2(\{x,y\})$ for any edge $\{x,y\}$ of $\mathbb{H}^2_*$.

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\beta_{\mathbb{T}_*}(e,\lambda)=\mathbf{P}_{e_*}^{\mathbb{T}_*,c_0}(e_*\to\infty)=\mathbf{P}_{e_*}^{\mathbb{H}^2_*,c_0}(e_*\to\infty)=\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{H}^2_*,c_0}(e_*\leftrightarrow\infty),\\
&\beta_{\mathbb{H}^i_*}(e,\lambda)=\mathbf{P}_{e_*}^{\mathbb{H}^i_*,c_i}(e_*\to\infty)=\mathbf{P}_{e_*}^{\mathbb{H}^2_*,c_i}(e_*\to\infty)=\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{H}^2_*,c_i}(e_*\leftrightarrow\infty),\ \ i=1,2.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall Rayleigh's monotonicity principle from [13] Section 2.4: Let G be an infinite connected graph with two nonnegative edge weight functions c and c' such that $c\le c'$ everywhere. Then for any vertex a of G, $\mathcal{C}_{G,c}(a\leftrightarrow\infty)\le\mathcal{C}_{G,c'}(a\leftrightarrow\infty)$.

Therefore, we have that

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{H}^2_*,c_1}(e_*\leftrightarrow\infty)\le\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{H}^2_*,c_0}(e_*\leftrightarrow\infty)\le\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{H}^2_*,c_2}(e_*\leftrightarrow\infty).$$

Namely

$$\beta_{\mathbb{H}^1_*}(e,\lambda)\le\beta_{\mathbb{T}_*}(e,\lambda)\le\beta_{\mathbb{H}^2_*}(e,\lambda).$$

Hence by Lemma 2.2, we obtain that

$$1-\frac{\lambda\wedge m_1}{m_1}\le\beta_{\mathbb{T}_*}(e,\lambda)\le 1-\frac{\lambda}{m_2}.$$

The lemma holds. ∎

Now we are in the position to prove the following lemma on derivative of $\beta(e,\lambda)$:

Lemma 2.4. *For Galton-Watson tree $\mathbb{T}$ without leaves, almost surely, $\beta(e)=\beta(e,\lambda)$ has continuous derivative $\beta'(e)=\beta'(e,\lambda)$ in $\lambda\in[0,m_1)$, and*

$$0<-\beta'(e,\lambda)\le\frac{\beta(e,\lambda)}{m_1-\lambda},\ \lambda\in[0,m_1). \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. Derivating (2.1) in $\lambda<m$ yields that

$$-\beta_n'(x,\lambda)=A_n(x)\sum_{i=1}^{\nu(x)}-\beta_n'(xi,\lambda)+B_n(x),$$

where $\beta_n'(x,\lambda)$ is the derivative in λ. Then

$$-\beta_n'(e,\lambda)=\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\sum_{|x|=k}B_n(x)\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}A_n(x_i),\ \lambda<m, \tag{2.4}$$

where x_i is the ancestor at generation i of x. And for any $k\in[0,n-1]$,

$$\beta_n(e,\lambda)=\sum_{|x|=k}\beta_n(x,\lambda)\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\frac{1}{\lambda+\sum_{i=1}^{\nu(x_i)}\beta_n(x_ij,\lambda)},\ \lambda<m.$$

Here x_ij is the j-th child of the ancestor x_i.

Clearly, $\beta_n(x,\lambda)$ is nonincreasing in n. By Lemma 2.3, we have that

$$\lambda+\sum_{i=1}^{\nu(x)}\beta_n(xi,\lambda)\ge m_1,\ \lambda<m.$$

Hence, for $\lambda<m$,

$$A_n(x)\le\frac{1}{m_1}\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+\sum_{i=1}^{\nu(x)}\beta_n(xi,\lambda)},\ B_n(x)\le\frac{1}{m_1}\beta_n(x,\lambda). \tag{2.5}$$

And for $\lambda<m$,

$$\sum_{|x|=k}B_n(x)\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}A_n(x_i)\le\frac{1}{m_1^{k+1}}\sum_{|x|=k}\beta_n(x,\lambda)\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+\sum_{i=1}^{\nu(x_i)}\beta_n(x_ij,\lambda)}=\frac{\lambda^k}{m_1^k}\frac{1}{m_1}\beta_n(e,\lambda). \tag{2.6}$$

By (2.4) and (2.6), almost surely,

$$0\le-\beta_n'(e,\lambda)\le\frac{\beta_n(e,\lambda)}{m_1-\lambda}\le\frac{1}{m_1-\lambda},\ \lambda<m_1. \tag{2.7}$$

Given any small enough $\epsilon>0$. From (2.7), we see that almost surely,

$$\{(\beta_n(e,\lambda):\ \lambda\in[0,m_1-\epsilon])\}_{n\ge1},$$

as a sequence of functions on $[0,m_1-\epsilon]$, is equi-continuous. Combining with $\beta_n(e,\lambda)\downarrow\beta(e,\lambda)$ as $n\uparrow\infty$ for all $\lambda\in[0,m)$, *a.s.*, by the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem, $\{\beta_n(e,\lambda):\ \lambda\in[0,m_1-\epsilon]\}_{n\ge1}$ converges uniformly to $(\beta(e,\lambda):\ \lambda\in[0,m_1-\epsilon])$ almost surely.

Note for any vertex $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $\left(\{(\beta_n(x,\lambda):\ 0\le\lambda<m)\}_{n\ge1},\ (\beta(x,\lambda):\ 0\le\lambda<m)\right)$ has the same distribution as $\left(\{(\beta_n(e,\lambda):\ 0\le\lambda<m)\}_{n\ge1},\ (\beta(e,\lambda):\ 0\le\lambda<m)\right)$. We obtain that almost surely, for any vertex $x\in\mathbb{T}$, $\{\beta_n(x,\lambda):\ \lambda\in[0,m_1-\epsilon]\}_{n\ge1}$ converges uniformly to $(\beta(x,\lambda):\ \lambda\in[0,m_1-\epsilon])$. Hence by the definitions of $A_n(x)$ and $B_n(x)$, we have that almost surely, for any vertex x, $A_n(x)$ and $B_n(x)$ converge uniformly in $\lambda\in[0,m_1-\epsilon]$ to some continuous functions $A(x)$ and $B(x)$ respectively.

Notice (2.4) and (2.6). By the dominated convergence theorem, we see that almost surely, $(\beta_n'(x,\lambda):\ \lambda\in[0,m_1-\epsilon])$ converges uniformly to some continuous function $(F_\lambda:\ \lambda\in[0,m_1-\epsilon])$. And by the dominated convergence theorem again, almost surely, $\int_0^\lambda \beta_n'(e,s)\ \mathrm{d}s$ converges to $\int_0^\lambda F_s\ \mathrm{d}s$ which is also $\beta(e,\lambda)-1$ for all $\lambda\le m_1-\epsilon$.

Since ϵ is arbitrary, we obtain that almost surely, $\beta(e,\lambda)$ is differentiable in $\lambda\in[0,m_1)$. And further, almost surely,

$$0\le-\beta'(e,\lambda)\le\frac{\beta(e)}{m_1-\lambda},\ \lambda\in[0,m_1).$$

By checking (2.4) and definitions of $A_n(x)$ and $B_n(x)$, when taking limits, we indeed have almost surely,

$$0<-\beta'(e,\lambda)\le\frac{\beta(e)}{m_1-\lambda},\ \lambda\in[0,m_1).$$

∎

By symmetry, we have that

$$\ell_\lambda=\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu-\lambda}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^\nu\beta_i}{\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^\nu\beta_i}\right)/\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu+\lambda}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^\nu\beta_i}{\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^\nu\beta_i}\right).$$

By Lemma 2.4, each β_i has derivative in $\lambda\in[0,m_1)$, and so does ℓ_λ. Write each β_i' and ℓ_λ' for the derivatives in $\lambda\in[0,m_1)$ of β_i and ℓ_λ respectively. Then by a straightforward calculus [1], for $\lambda\in[0,m_1)$, $\ell_\lambda'<0$ is equivalent with

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^\nu\beta_i}{\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^\nu\beta_i}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^\nu(\beta_i+(1-\lambda)\beta_i')}{(\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^\nu\beta_i)^2}\right)\\&\quad-\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^\nu\beta_i}{\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^\nu\beta_i}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^\nu(\beta_i+(1-\lambda)\beta_i')}{(\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^\nu\beta_i)^2}\right)\\&<\frac{1}{\lambda}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^\nu\beta_i}{\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^\nu\beta_i}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^\nu\beta_i}{\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^\nu\beta_i}\right).\end{aligned}\tag{2.8}$$

Lemma 2.5. *For Galton-Watson tree $\mathbb{T}$ without leaves, (2.8) is true for $\lambda\in\left[0,\frac{m_1}{1+\sqrt{1-\frac{1}{m_1}}}\right]$ when $m_1\ge2$.*

Proof. Note that by Lemma 2.4,

$$0 < -\beta_i'(\lambda) \le \frac{\beta_i(\lambda)}{m_1 - \lambda},\ \lambda < m_1,\ i \ge 0.$$

By Lemma 2.3,

$$\lambda - 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\nu} \beta_i \ge \lambda - 1 + (1 - \lambda/m_1) \times (m_1 + 1) = m_1 - \frac{\lambda}{m_1} > m_1 - 1,\ \lambda < m_1. \tag{2.9}$$

Then for any $\lambda < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &0 \le \beta_i(\lambda) + (1-\lambda)\beta_i'(\lambda) < \beta_i(\lambda), \\ &\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}{\lambda - 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}(\beta_i + (1-\lambda)\beta_i')}{(\lambda - 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i)^2}\right) \ge 0. \end{aligned}$$

And further when $\lambda < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}{\lambda - 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}(\beta_i + (1-\lambda)\beta_i')}{(\lambda - 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i)^2}\right) \\ &< \frac{1}{m_1 - \frac{\lambda}{m_1}}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}{\lambda - 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}{\lambda - 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda < 1$ and $m_1 \ge 2$, $m_1 - \frac{\lambda}{m_1} > \lambda$, we obtain that when $\lambda < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}{\lambda - 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}(\beta_i + (1-\lambda)\beta_i')}{(\lambda - 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i)^2}\right) \\ &\quad -\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}{\lambda - 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}(\beta_i + (1-\lambda)\beta_i')}{(\lambda - 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i)^2}\right) \\ &< \frac{1}{\lambda}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}{\lambda - 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}{\lambda - 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right); \end{aligned}$$

namely (2.8) holds.

When $\lambda = 1$, (2.8) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\frac{1}{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right) - \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\frac{1}{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right) \\ &< \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

While by Lemma 2.3, $\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i(1) \ge m_1 - \frac{1}{m_1} > 1$, which implies the above inequality.

When $m_1 > \lambda > 1$,

$$\beta_i + (1-\lambda)\beta_i' \le \frac{m_1 - 1}{m_1 - \lambda}\beta_i.$$

Combining with (2.9), we obtain that for $1 < \lambda < m_1$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}{\lambda - 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}(\beta_i + (1-\lambda)\beta_i')}{(\lambda - 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i)^2}\right)$$

$$\leq \frac{\frac{m_1-1}{m_1-\lambda}}{m_1-\frac{\lambda}{m_1}}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}{\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}{\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right).$$

When $\frac{\frac{m_1-1}{m_1-\lambda}}{m_1-\frac{\lambda}{m_1}} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}$ and $1<\lambda<m_1$, namely $\lambda \in \left(1, \frac{m_1}{1+\sqrt{1-\frac{1}{m_1}}}\right]$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}{\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}(\beta_i+(1-\lambda)\beta_i')}{(\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i)^2}\right)\\ &\quad\leq \frac{1}{\lambda}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}{\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}{\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right). \qquad (2.10)\end{aligned}$$

Note when $1<\lambda<m_1$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}(\beta_i+(1-\lambda)\beta_i') > \sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i > 0,\\ &\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}{\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu+1}\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}(\beta_i+(1-\lambda)\beta_i')}{(\lambda-1+\sum_{i=0}^{\nu}\beta_i)^2}\right) > 0.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, combining with (2.10), we see that for $\lambda \in \left(1, \frac{m_1}{1+\sqrt{1-\frac{1}{m_1}}}\right]$, (2.8) holds. ∎

So far we have finished proving Theorem 1.2. ∎

References

[1] E. Aïdékon. (2013). Monotonicity for $\lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Preprint. (http://www.proba.jussieu.fr/dw/lib/exe/fetch.php?media=users:aidekon:noteaidekon.pdf)

[2] E. Aïdékon. (2014). Speed of the biased random walk on a Galton-Watson tree. *Probab. Theory Rel. Fields.* **159**, 597-617.

[3] G. Ben Arous, A. Fribergh. (2014). Biased random walks on random graphs. arXiv: 1406.5076v1 [math.PR].

[4] G. Ben Arous, A. Fribergh, V. Sidoravicius. (2014). Lyons-Pemantle-Peres monotonicity problem for high biases. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **67(4)**, 519-530.

[5] A. Berretti, A. D. Sokal. (1985). New Monte Carlo method for the self-avoiding walk. *J. Stat. Physics.* **40**, 483-531.

[6] G. Ben Arous, Y.-Y. Hu, S. Olla, O. Zeitouni. (2013). Einstein relation for biased random walk on Galton-Watson trees. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincar Probab. Statist.* **49(3)**, 698-721.

[7] N. Gantert, S. Müller, S. Popov, M. Vachkovskaia. (2012). Random walks on Galton-Watson trees with random conductances. *Stoc. Proc. Appl.* **122(4)**, 1652-1671.

[8] R. Lyons. (1990). Random walks and percolation on trees. *Ann. Probab.* **18**, 931-958.

[9] R. Lyons. (1992). Random walks, capacity, and percolation on trees. *Ann. Probab.* **20**, 2043-2088.

[10] R. Lyons, R. Pemantle, Y. Peres. (1995). Ergodic theory on Galton-Watson trees: speed of random walk and dimension of harmonic measure. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **15**, 593-619.

[11] R. Lyons, R. Pemantle, Y. Peres. (1996). Biased random walks on Galton-Watson trees. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields.* **106(2)**, 249-264.

[12] R. Lyons, R. Pemantle, Y. Peres. (1997). Unsolved problems concerning random walks on trees. *Classical and Modern Branching Processes* (K. Athreya and P. Jagers (editors)), pp. 223-238. Springer, New York.

[13] R. Lyons, Y. Peres. (2014). Probability on trees and networks (http://mypage.iu.edu/~rdlyons). Book in preparation.

[14] H. Song, K.-N. Xiang. (2015). Biased random walk on block free product groups: speed. Preprint.